

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Claim 10 has been amended to delete “sufficiently.” The rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 is therefore believed to be moot. Claim 10 has also been amended to recite that the screw set is supported only at one end. Basis for this is inherent in the description of an extruder, as set forth below.

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, and 8-11 were again rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by the U.S. patent to Inoue et al ‘593. In response, Applicant maintains the previously presented arguments which are incorporated by reference into the present response.

Beyond this, Applicant again respectfully submits that Inoue et al neither anticipates nor renders obvious the subject matter of the amended claims. Claim 10 recites a twin screw extruder for mixing and dispersing a material to be needed. Applicant had previously pointed out that the embodiment of Figure 1 of Inoue et al is not an extruder but is instead a kneader. Kneaders are structurally different from extruders in a number of ways, including the fact that the screw sets of continuous kneaders are supported at both ends whereas the screw sets of extruders are not supported at the extrusion end. Claim 10 therefore now recites that the screw set is rotatably supported only at one end. In contrast, it is evident from Figs. 2A-2B of Inoue et al that the screw sets thereof are supported by bearings at both ends.

Examiner has taken the position that the kneader of Inoue et al is an “extruder” because the dictionary meaning of “extrude” is to push out, and so any device – including a kneader -- which pushes out material qualifies under the broadest reasonable interpretation of an extruder. However, the examiner is respectfully reminded that the “broadest reasonable interpretation” simply means that the claims are given their “plain meaning,” i.e., their ordinary and customary meaning “given to them by those of ordinary skill in the art” (MPEP


§ 2111.01(II)). Thus the relevant meaning of “extruder” is that ordinarily and customarily understood by those skilled in the art.

In fact, the term “extruder” is a term of art which has a specific meaning to those in the art of plastic processing: a device which performs extrusion by forcing molten material through a shaping device attached to the end of the extruder. As such, it does not apply to any device which pushes out material but would be understood by those skilled in the art to be limited to devices which have one or more screw sets supported only at one end and force molten material through a shaping device attached to the other end of the extruder. As evidence of this, see the attached explanation of plastic extrusion from *Kirk Othmer Encyclopedia of Chemical Technology*, vol. 19, pp 293-303, especially pp 293-94. Figs. 1 and 2 of *Kirk Othmer* clearly show that the screw is supported at one end. Since the Inoue et al reference simply discloses a plastic kneader which is supported by bearings at both ends and discharges the material without shaping in a shaping device, it does not conform to the plain meaning of an extruder and so the claims clearly define over this reference.

Applicant therefore believes that the present application is in a condition for allowance and respectfully solicits an early notice of allowability.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Norman F. Oblon
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 24,618

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)
RTP:aif

Robert T. Pous
Registration No. 29,099